DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 954 UD 026 140

AUTHOR Funkhouser, Janie E.; Moore, Mary T.
TITLE A Study of Magnet Schools and the Chapter 1 Program for Disadvantaged Students. Revised.
INSTITUTION Decision Resources Corp., Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Nov 86
NOTE 83p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attendance; *Board of Education Policy; *Compensatory Education; Conflict; Economically Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Programs; *Magnet Schools; Poverty Programs; Program Evaluation; Racial Integration; Residence Requirements; *School Desegregation; School District Autonomy; *School District Reorganization; School District Spending; State School District Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

Because magnet schools restructure school and district attendance area boundaries in order to achieve racial heterogeneity, they attempt to disassemble the very unit towards which the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act Chapter 1 program targets its resources--neighborhood schools attended by poor children. A nine-district survey of the relationship between magnet schools and the Chapter 1 program revealed the following findings: (1) the definition of school attendance areas of magnet schools is not, in and of itself, a critical issue as far as school targeting is concerned; (2) survey respondents did not express concern over the effect of magnet school designs on Chapter 1 school targeting; (3) variables affecting the degree to which magnet schools alter schools' poverty concentration often operate in concert; (4) concern was more often expressed about students losing Chapter 1 instruction than about schools losing Chapter 1 status; (5) comparability requirements were not viewed as an impediment to magnet school development; (6) further study is needed to determine what interrelationships exist between desegregation efforts beyond the magnet schools component; (7) the receipt of extra services through either the Chapter 1 program or a magnet school program does not affect eligibility for the other program; and (8) resources supplied for Chapter 1 use did not appear to be used for creation of a magnet school. A list of references is included. Appendices provide the survey instruments, tabulate summary data, and profile the districts surveyed. (BJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

5-17-88

DECISION
RESOURCES
CORPORATION

1828 L STREET N.W. ■ SUITE 500 ■ WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 ■ (202) 223-5555

ED293954

A Study of Magnet Schools and the Chapter 1 Program for Disadvantaged Students

Janie E. Funkhouser
Mary T. Moore

Submitted to the
Office of Educational Research and Improvement

Chapter 1 Study Team
November, 1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD026140

A STUDY OF MAGNET SCHOOLS AND THE CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
INTRODUCTION	1
Background and Purpose	1
Research Questions	2
Study Design	3
Summary Profile of Sample Districts	6
Study Limitations	7
Organization of this Report	8
Definition of Chapter 1 Program and Other Terminology Used in this Report	9
FINDINGS	11
Targeting Schools	11
Background	11
Questions and Findings	12
Summary	16
Serving Students	19
Background	19
Questions and Findings	19
Summary	21
Comparability	23
Background	23
Questions and Findings	25
Summary	26
Desegregation, Magnet Schools and Chapter 1	30
Background	30
Questions and Findings	30
Other Program Interactions	31

MEMORANDUM

TO: Marty Orland, OERI

FROM: Janie Funkhouser, DRC JFJ

DATE: November 17, 1986

SUBJECT: Revised Report on Magnet Schools and Chapter 1

Enclosed are seven copies of the revised report on Magnet Schools and Chapter 1. I have addressed the major comments made by the Chapter 1 Study Team on the first draft. I trust you will find these revisions are adequate, but please do not hesitate to call if you need to discuss a particular item(s) further.

DRC
1828 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 223-5555
Telex: 499-5993

Page

REFERENCES..... 34
APPENDIX A..... A-1
APPENDIX B..... B-1
APPENDIX C..... C-1
APPENDIX D..... D-1
APPENDIX E..... E-1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In December 1983, the U.S. Congress passed legislation which required the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) to conduct a National Assessment of the Chapter 1 program. As part of this effort, OERI asked DRC to conduct a small-scale study of how the Chapter 1 LEA basic grants program is affected by or interacts with magnet schools. This inquiry is intended to complement other large-scale studies sponsored by OERI.

This study provides a qualitative inquiry into the relationship between magnet schools and the Chapter 1 program. An underlying premise of both desegregation efforts, including magnet schools, and compensatory education, including Chapter 1, is that public schools have an important responsibility to ameliorate basic social conditions which negatively affect the performance of children in schools. Both forms of intervention also concentrate considerable resources particularly in large urban districts, and therefore, are likely to have overlapping target populations. These two attempts at educational reform, however, differ most fundamentally in their core approach. Magnet schools are designed to attack the negative effects of concentrations of racial minorities by restructuring school and in some instances district attendance area boundaries so that there is more racial heterogeneity at the school level. One of the salient characteristics of magnet schools, then, is that they almost always draw students from two or more traditional "neighborhood" school boundaries. Chapter 1, on the other hand, is designed to attack the negative effects of concentrations of poverty -- highly related to concentrations of racial minorities -- by targeting additional resources to neighborhood schools based on the number of poor children in attendance. Thus, magnet schools attempt to disassemble the very unit upon which the Chapter 1 program targets its resources. Probably all districts using magnet schools as a desegregation strategy receive Chapter 1 funds and the manner in which these two fundamentally different approaches cooperate has never been systematically examined.

Major findings include:

- Respondents in the nine districts in our study did not identify any problems in defining the school attendance areas of magnet schools, and in all cases reported that they are defined in the same manner as those of all other schools in the district. However, information provided by a district contacted for the pre-test as well as by other National Assessment Researchers indicates that for ranking purposes the

definition of school attendance areas of magnet schools does indeed receive special consideration in some districts. Respondents to our survey could yield no information on the consequences of these special definitions for targeting. This leads one to believe that the definition of the school attendance areas of magnet schools is not, in and of itself, a critical issue as far as school targeting is concerned.

o Overall, respondents to our survey did not express concern over the effect of magnet school designs on Chapter 1 school targeting. Reasons for this lack of concern include 1) the fact that most districts use residence to rank schools, and 2) in those districts using the enrollment option, the speed with which and the degree to which student composition is actually altered in magnet schools is not great. Variables affecting the degree to which magnet schools alter the poverty concentration of schools often operate in concert. They include:

  - The existence of a court order to desegregate and the degree of success involved;

  - The speed with which magnet schools draw in children from other attendance areas;

  - The number of different attendance areas from which children enrolled in the magnet school transfer;

  - The type of magnet programs offered and the type of students they attract;

  - Prior use of Chapter 1 provisions such as "no-wide-variance" and "the 25 percent rule" to serve all schools in the Chapter 1 designated grade span.

- Respondents in the study districts more often expressed concern about students losing or receiving diminished Chapter 1 instruction as a result of magnet school designs than about schools losing Chapter 1 status. Respondents identified three ways in which services to needy students in magnet schools are affected.

  1. Chapter 1 services can diminish in amount or quality;

  2. Loss of service can occur; or

  3. A greater amount or higher quality of Chapter 1 service may be provided to needy students in magnet schools.

  Respondents' concerns regarding diminished services are somewhat inconsistent with findings of the Resource Allocation study (another National Assessment Study), although not entirely so. Resource Allocation researchers report that most districts in their sample set strict Chapter 1 caseload levels for project schools. These requirements dictate the number of students assigned to a Chapter 1 teacher and the number of remedial sessions provided to a student. If caseload requirements are strictly enforced, Chapter 1 services should not diminish as a result of reduced Chapter 1 allocations or as a result of overcrowding. However, not all districts set caseload requirements for Chapter 1 schools, and when such requirements are in effect the degree to which they are enforced is currently an unanswered question. Any analysis of the effects of magnet school designs on the delivery of Chapter 1 services to needy students should include careful attention to the method by which Chapter 1 resources are allocated in districts.

- The concern over Chapter 1's comparability provision and magnet schools centers around the fact that the greater resources involved in magnet schools may deter districts from adopting these programs for fear of running afoul of the comparability

requirement. Respondents in the study districts did not view comparability requirements as an impediment to magnet school development. There is an official ED interpretation of the comparability requirement as it relates to magnet schools. The interpretation states that magnet schools may be excluded from computation of the district-wide level of services. While one district reported excluding magnet schools from comparability calculations, it was not done for the reason outlined in the ED interpretation. In the absence of knowledge of this interpretation, respondents identified a number of factors which mitigate against the existence of conflicts between the comparability provision and magnet school development. They include:

- The relatively small number of magnet schools compared to the total number of nonproject schools;

- The fact that monies expended on magnet programs are frequently from federal sources and are therefore not reported for purposes of comparability;

- The fact that some districts preempt potential comparability problems by allocating more resources to Chapter 1 schools than to non-Chapter 1 schools;

- The fact that some districts avoid comparability problems by placing magnet programs in a different grade span than applies to the provision of Chapter 1 services, thus avoiding the need to make comparability comparisons; and

- The fact that in some districts, all magnet programs are located in Chapter 1 attendance areas.

- Responses to our survey indicate that Chapter 1 problems attributed to desegregation (and vice versa) are not substantially <u>different</u> problems from those involving magnet schools. However, other forms of desegregation tend to bring about changes in school composition and attendance areas much more rapidly than do magnet schools in the districts we surveyed. Because our sample of districts had been desegregating for some time, the issues related to Chapter 1 services may have been resolved or muted in their significance by the time we asked our questions. Moreover, the respondents contacted in the sample may not have known the larger issues, present or past, affecting desegregation and compensatory education, given their operational roles--administration of magnet schools and coordination of Chapter 1 programs. Thus, one cannot conclude that important inter-relationships do not exist between desegregation efforts beyond the magnet schools component. Rather, these dynamics may require a different mode of inquiry (e.g., a longitudinal perspective and on-site visits) and the use of different respondents than those used in this study.

- No respondent identified any area in which the enactment of Chapter 1 (as opposed to Title I) made a difference with regard to magnet schools.

- Other difficulties <u>implementing magnet school designs</u> attributed to the existence of Chapter 1 include:

  - Unwillingness of parents of needy students to send them to magnet schools that do not offer Chapter 1 services;

  - Unwillingness of parents of non-Chapter 1 students to send them to magnet schools that <u>do</u> offer Chapter 1 services (which to some parents denotes educational deprivation);

- The schedule of a Chapter 1 student may not be flexible enough to allow him/her to participate fully in some magnet programs.

o Other difficulties implementing Chapter 1 that can be attributed to the existence of magnet schools include the fact that magnet schools are often crowded schools; this can present problems depending on the instructional setting used for Chapter 1.

o In the nine study districts, the receipt of extra or special services through either the Chapter 1 program or a magnet school program does not affect eligibility for the other program, except in districts where these programs are geared towards two different populations. In other words, no respondent expressed concern over serving some students "twice" by virtue of the fact that they may participate in both Chapter 1 and a magnet school program. Some concern and attention was mentioned with respect to reducing any fragmentation in a student's educational program.

o Chapter 1 purchased equipment or other resources enhancing a school environment did not appear to be used to help "create" a magnet program in that school.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Background and Purpose

In December 1983, the U.S. Congress passed legislation which required the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) to conduct a National Assessment of the Chapter 1 program. As part of this effort, OERI asked DRC to conduct a small-scale study of how the Chapter 1 LEA basic grants program is affected by or interacts with magnet schools. This inquiry is intended to complement other large-scale studies sponsored by OERI.

Magnet schools were first developed in large urban districts to reduce racial segregation through voluntary means. Many magnet programs were developed under court order, while others resulted from a threatened court order; still others evolved voluntarily. Magnet schools promise a distinctive educational program that will attract a cross-section of students of all races. According to Flemming et al. (1982), 59 percent of magnet schools are elementary level, and these are usually defined in terms of a pedagogical style (such as emphasis on "the basics" or on discipline). Magnets at the high school level offer special enrichment in certain areas of curriculum, such as math and science or the arts. In 1976, Congress passed an amendment to the Emergency School Aid Act authorizing grants to support magnet school development for districts in the process of desegregating; this federal support shepherded the expansion of the magnet school concept. According to 1981-82 data, there were over 1,000 magnet schools in more than 130 of the largest urban school districts (James Lowry and Associates, 1983).

A basic tension underlies the relationship of the magnet school approach to desegregation and the compensatory education strategy embodied in Chapter 1. Both desegregation through magnet schools and the provision of supplemental remedial services through Chapter 1 are large scale government interventions aimed at improving the quality of education for disadvantaged school-aged children. An underlying premise of both desegregation efforts, including magnet schools, and compensatory education, including Chapter 1, is that public schools have an important responsibility to ameliorate basic social conditions that negatively affect the performance of children in schools. Both forms of intervention also concentrate considerable resources particularly in large urban districts, and therefore, are likely to have overlapping target populations.

These two attempts at educational reform, however, differ fundamentally in their core approach. Magnet schools are designed to attack the negative effects of concentrations of racial minorities by restructuring school and in some instances district attendance area boundaries so that there is more racial heterogeneity at the school level. One of the salient characteristics of magnet schools, then, is that they almost always draw students from two or more traditional "neighborhood" school boundaries. Chapter 1, on the other hand, is designed to attack the negative effects of concentrations of poverty--highly related to concentrations of racial minorities--by targeting additional resources to neighborhood schools based on the number of poor children in attendance. Thus, magnet schools attempt to disassemble the very unit upon which the Chapter 1 program targets its resources. Several exceptions to Chapter 1's basic targeting provisions, such as school selection based on educational rather than economic deprivation and the 25% rule, have been set up or used to achieve some degree of harmony between these two fundamentally different approaches. Nonetheless, probably all districts using magnet schools as a desegregation strategy receive Chapter 1 funds and the manner in which these two fundamentally different approaches co-operate has never been systematically examined.

Further, the relationship between the Chapter 1 program and magnet schools assumes increasing importance to educators and policymakers in the wake of movement away from mandatory desegregation plans in some city school districts. Such action was the topic of a recent (6-5-1986) Dan Rather CBS Evening News Report. Recognition of the fact that under certain circumstances, a number of schools maintain a low likelihood of achieving an acceptable racial balance has caused concerned parties to search for various solutions to deal realistically with the problem of racial isolation. Magnet schools that emphasize parental choice and enhanced curricular offerings represent one increasingly popular alternative to forced busing. This inquiry attempts to uncover ways in which the Chapter 1 program may be affected by and interact with magnet schools.

Research Questions

With these general considerations in mind, we identified a set of research questions to examine the relationship between the Chapter 1 program and magnet schools:

1. What are the effects on Chapter 1 school targeting when the student composition of schools is altered by magnet programs?

2. In what ways are Chapter 1 services to needy students affected by magnet school designs?

3. Is the Chapter 1 comparability provision an impediment to magnet schools?

4. What other problems, if any, occur in Chapter 1 projects operating in districts with magnet schools?

5. Are the problems uncovered with respect to magnet schools and Chapter 1 unique to magnet schools or are they present in other types of desegregation efforts as well?

Study Design

The study provides a qualitative inquiry into the relationship between magnet schools and the Chapter 1 program. It does not address the broader issue of the relationship between magnet schools and desegregation efforts; to do so would involve a substantially larger research effort. Our study was designed in the following manner.

Literature on magnet schools was reviewed to determine whether any prior inquiries of this type exist, as well as to identify pertinent authors to guide the selection of districts with magnet school programs for inclusion in the study. While descriptive and analytic literature on magnet schools abounds, no research has focused specifically on the relationship between magnet schools and the Chapter 1 program.* The literature review did direct us to the primary author of the most recent national survey of magnet schools, conducted by James H. Lowry and Associates, with whose help we were able to select a sample of districts to include in our study.

Rolf K. Blank, primary author of Survey of Magnet Schools: Analyzing a Model for Quality Integrated Education, the final report of a study for the U.S. Department of Education, provided us with a list of 138 urban school districts with magnet schools, as well as the number and grade levels of these schools. This database was current as of the 1981-82 school year, and constitutes the most recently compiled list of such

---

* Researchers have often addressed issues of large-scale desegregation efforts and resulting effects on the delivery of Chapter 1 services, however, we limit the main focus of this study specifically to magnet schools.

districts. We also relied on the definition of magnet schools specified in the James H. Lowry and Associates report. Magnet schools offer:

1. A distinctive curriculum based on a special theme or pedagogical style;

2. A means of voluntary desegregation;

3. Voluntary choice of the school by the student and the parent; and

4. Open access to school enrollment beyond the regular attendance zone.

Further, the Lowry and Associates report identified distinctive ways in which magnet schools are structured:

1. Total-school magnets - "in which all the students are in the magnet program for their entire curriculum";

2. School-within-a-school magnets "where a portion of the building and the students are in a magnet curriculum";

3. Add-on-program - "that offers magnet theme courses for part of the day to some or all students in a building"; and

4. Magnet center program - "that offers magnet theme courses on a part time basis to students from several different schools.

Findings from the James H. Lowry report indicate that total school magnets were the most prevalent organizational type at each school level when these data were collected; total school magnets accounted for 63 percent of elementary programs, 62 percent of middle/junior high programs, and 61 percent of senior high programs.

Prior to adoption of a final interview instrument, we conducted an informal interview about magnet schools and Chapter 1 with the Chapter 1 coordinator in a large urban school district; this interview provided useful information and assisted in focusing research questions. When discussing study findings, this district will be referred to as the "pre-study" district. Nine school districts were selected for inclusion in the study. The selection criteria included region of the country (covering the Northeast, Southeast, Southwest, Northwest, Midwest, and the West) and the existence of at least two elementary level magnet schools, since Chapter 1 services

are most often targeted to students in these grades. Additionally, to reduce burden we avoided selecting districts which had been contacted for inclusion in other case studies conducted as part of the National Assessment of Chapter 1.

Letters of introduction to the study were mailed to Chapter 1 coordinators in the nine districts, requesting permission to interview them over the telephone for approximately 30 minutes. We also requested the name and telephone number of someone involved in the implementation of the magnet schools program, and we interviewed these contacts over the telephone as well, for an approximately equal length of time. All interviews were conducted between May 1 and June 10, 1986. All districts originally selected agreed to participate in the study.

The interview instrument is provided in Appendix A. The entire instrument was not administered to each respondent; rather those questions we thought were applicable to each position were posed to the Chapter 1 coordinator and the magnet school specialist, respectively. Certain key questions were posed to both respondents. Further, in many instances one or both respondents suggested an additional respondent could better answer a particular question or two. Thus, while the interview protocol maintained a basic structure and sequencing of questions, a certain amount of flexibility and open-ended response was encouraged in the interview process.

Further, one respondent from each district (usually the Chapter 1 coordinator) received a "mini-questionnaire" to complete (see Appendix B). This questionnaire provided basic background information on the district in terms of enrollment, number and grade level of magnet and Chapter 1 schools, the number of schools in which these programs overlap, the Chapter 1 allocation, and a few other items collected by all researchers conducting National Assessment Studies. These data were collected to hopefully permit selected cross-study analyses.

Finally, principal investigators responsible for various case studies conducted as part of the National Assessment of Chapter 1 were contacted to discuss any issues they uncovered relevant to the relationship between magnet schools and Chapter 1. In summary, the findings presented here emerge from a variety of sources, the core of which comprised telephone interviews with Chapter 1 coordinators and magnet school specialists in nine districts. Various other individuals in the nine districts as well as researchers involved in other relevant National Assessment studies contributed to this effort.

Summary Profile of Sample Districts

Following is a short summary profile of the districts in this sample. A more detailed summary is provided in tabular form in Appendix C. Further information on each individual district is presented (also in tabular form) in Appendix D. Finally, written descriptions of individual districts as relayed by respondents to our survey appear in Appendix E.

The nine districts included in this study are spread across the country. There are two sample districts each in the Northeast, Southeast, and Southwest regions, and one sample district each in the Northwest, Midwest, and Western regions of the country. Public school enrollments in these districts range from 32,000 to 128,000. The percent minority students enrolled in public schools ranges from 23 to 79 percent; change over a five year period in the percent minority students enrolled in public schools varies from an increase of zero to 7 percentage points. Total district expenditures for education range from $111 million to $584.1 million.

Seven of the nine districts are currently under a court order to desegregate. In all but one of the seven districts, mandatory busing is used in conjunction with magnet schools to desegregate. The number of magnet schools varies from 5 to 27, ranging from 5 to 55 percent of all public schools in each district.

While all respondents viewed magnet schools as fulfilling a unique role with respect to desegregating school systems, in some cases this purpose was not currently viewed by respondents as the primary one. Magnet schools can assume the primary role of improving education quality. Even in these districts, however, the two goals of improving education quality and desegregating schools are not disparate ones; it is hoped that voluntary desegregation will occur as a result of an appeal to the public's desire for quality, "customized" education.

In all except one district, Chapter 1 serves at least those children in grades K through 6; the exception is a district serving students in grades K-3 only. Two districts serve students through grade 12. The percent of all public school students served by Chapter 1 varies from 10 to 40 percent. Chapter 1 services do not follow children transferring to ineligible schools in any of the nine districts in this study. Six districts are located in states where a separate SCE program also serves students in need. Students in these districts were served with Chapter 1 allocations ranging from a low of $2.7 million to a high of $16.1 million dollars.

In the majority of the nine districts (6 districts), schools are targeted as Chapter 1 project schools using student place of residence as a basis for ranking schools; in the remaining districts student enrollment is used to rank schools. The percent of all public schools designated as Chapter 1 project schools varies from 17 to 64 percent of public schools.

The extent to which Chapter 1 services are provided in magnet schools differs across districts. In one district, Chapter 1 services are not offered in any of the magnet schools. In another, all magnet schools offering magnet programs to students in the grade span served by Chapter 1 are Chapter 1 project schools. Most respondents mentioned at least one area of conflict between the two programs, even though in some cases the conflict was of a philosophical rather than a technical, service-oriented nature. There were instances in which the two programs were viewed as complementing one another. It should be noted that within a district, views as to whether the Chapter 1 program and magnet schools conflict with one another, complement one another, or fail to interact at any level, can differ substantially depending on the respondent. These differing views appear to arise in part due to differences in the level of knowledge officials of one program have of how the other program operates.

Limitations of the Study

This study, as noted previously, is intended to uncover ways in which the Chapter 1 program is affected by or interacts with the development of magnet schools. Although the sample includes at least one district from each region of the country, it is not representative based on any other criterion. While the findings presented here offer considerable insight into the interaction between the Chapter 1 program and magnet schools, it is not possible to draw generalized conclusions from these findings, about for example, the prevalence of specific conditions.

In addition, the Chapter 1 and magnet school programs operate within a much broader educational arena. The existence and effectiveness of other programs available to students in a district, (such as state or local compensatory education) can affect the scope and intent of local implementation of Chapter 1 as well as magnet school designs. In order to obtain a more complete and accurate description of how Chapter 1 and magnet schools interact, it would be necessary to conduct on-site interviews with a greater number of respondents than was possible within the scope of this immediate inquiry.

However, we believe that the diversity of our sample and the care taken to develop a broad understanding of how magnet schools operate in our sample districts yield information which is indicative of general patterns of interactions between Chapter 1 programs and magnet schools.

Organization of this Report

Our findings are discussed in the second section of this report and are organized according to the research questions outlined in the preceding section on "background and purpose." The bulk of findings are presented in light of their relevance to targeting schools for Chapter 1 and serving students in need.

Definition of Chapter 1 Program* and
Other Terminology Used in this Report

Chapter 1 Project School - a school in which Chapter 1 services are available.

Eligible Schools - schools which have been determined to be eligible to become Chapter 1 project schools. With certain exceptions this refers to schools with a higher than district average number or percent of low income children.

Targeting Schools - Selecting those schools which will become Chapter 1 project schools. Regulations attempt to insure that project schools are those with the highest concentrations of low income or educationally deprived children.

School Attendance Area - the geographical area in which the children who are normally served by that school reside.

Ranking Schools - rank ordering schools by the number or percentage of low income children either residing in the school attendance areas or by the number or percentage of children in average daily attendance at the school itself (school enrollment). Schools are ranked to target project schools if funds are inadequate to offer programs in all eligible schools.

Eligible Students - students who have been determined to be eligible to receive Chapter 1 services. Regulations attempt to insure that children served are those with the greatest educational need (determined by test scores and teacher assessments) in schools with the highest concentrations of low income students. Low achieving private school children are eligible for service if they reside in attendance areas whose public schools contain Chapter 1 programs.

"Grandfather Clause" - a district can continue to offer Title I services for two additional years in a school that lost its eligibility because of population changes.

---

* Many of these definitions are discussed in detail in the Report on Changes Under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation an Improvement Act, prepared for the subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, United States House of Representatives, September 1985.

No-Wide-Variance - a district could treat as eligible, and serve, all of its schools if no two schools in the district differ in their concentrations of low income children by more than 5 percent, or one-third of the district average, whichever is greater.

The 25 Percent Rule - a district can serve any school with a 25 percent or greater concentration of low income children, even if that school's concentration is below the district average.

Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981, consolidated 28 formerly funded discretionary programs under a single program authorization. While all districts receive some Chapter 2 monies, not all districts use a portion of these funds for desegregation efforts.

The Magnet School Assistance Act was passed in 1984 as part of the Education for Economic Security Act and was intended to aid those districts which lost large amounts of federal desegregation aid due to budget cuts and the new Chapter 2 formula.

CHAPTER 2

Findings

Targeting Schools

Background

In order to identify those schools eligible for Chapter 1, districts are required to decide the grade span in which to offer services. Next, (assuming the district has more than one school in the chosen grade span), the district must rank schools by the number or percentage of low income children either (1) residing in the schools' attendance areas or (2) actually enrolled in the schools. With special exceptions, schools with a higher than district average number or percent of low income children are designated as project schools.* Usually, districts determine the number or percentage of low income children by counting children eligible for the National School Lunch Program.

Most districts rank schools by the number or percentage of low income children residing in school attendance areas (Dougherty, 1985). When districts opt to use residence as a basis for ranking schools, officials relate a measure of poverty (e.g., students eligible for the National School Lunch Program) to the school attendance area. Since most children attend the school to which they are assigned, it is not difficult to make this linkage. However, many children who attend magnet schools do not reside in that area, i.e., children transfer to magnet schools. The linkage between a child and his or her "school of residence" becomes more cumbersome.

Counting students based on enrollments, on the other hand, has been noted as a useful tool in districts with an open enrollment plan, a desegregation program, or a large private school population, i.e., where there are schools in which potentially large numbers of students are enrolled in schools outside their regular attendance areas (Dougherty, 1985).

---

* Chapter 1 omits Title I's explicit rule that districts unable to serve all eligible schools must serve schools in rank order; however, according to the Dougherty report, 43 out of 49 State Chapter 1 Directors stated they would not allow districts to serve schools out of rank order.

In essence, in districts where schools are ranked using a poverty measure of students actually enrolled in schools, magnet schools present fewer technical problems because the district does not need to track the children back to their school of residence. For example, parents of students provide the school with information during the school year that enables school officials to determine student eligibility for the National School Lunch Program. Additionally, many educators support the enrollment option because they assert that the more relevant issue for purposes of targeting Chapter 1 funds is the actual composition of a school's student body and not the geographic area from which the school draws.

Magnet schools are defined in part by their policy of open enrollment beyond the regular school attendance area. The intent, as noted, is to alter the composition of school attendance areas with large minority enrollments by drawing students into these schools who would not normally enroll there. If successful, magnet school designs would also alter the poverty concentration of these schools, as schools with heavy concentrations of minority students tend also to exhibit a heavy concentration of low income students. In their attempt to alter the poverty concentrations, magnet school designs could operate at cross-purposes with the thrust of the Chapter 1 program plan for delivery of compensatory education services to educationally deprived children from low income areas.

Questions and Findings

The first school level research question identified in this study is:

> What are the effects on Chapter 1 school targeting when the student composition of schools has been altered by magnet programs?

Defining the School Attendance Area for Magnet Schools.

As noted, school targeting relies on the ranking of schools according to the number or percentage of low income children either actually enrolled in schools or residing in the schools' attendance areas. Thus, we hypothesized that for purposes of ranking, how a district defines the school attendance area of a magnet school could be a determinant of whether or not a magnet school is targeted as a Chapter 1 project school.

In all nine study districts, regardless of the use of school enrollment or residence as a basis for ranking schools, magnet schools are reportedly ranked for Chapter 1 purposes in

the same fashion as any other school in the district, and there are reportedly no written guidelines referring specifically to ranking magnet schools. However, in the "pre-study" district, we did uncover actual guidelines regarding the definition of school attendance areas and magnet schools. These guidelines state:

> "The eligibility of children is determined by whether or not the children reside in eligible (and served) attendance areas. These children attending the magnet school are plotted back to the attendance areas where they reside using the adjustment worksheet. The magnet school is therefore listed on the rank-ordering of schools in the LEA but shows no students as being low-income students, and no students residing in its attendance area. Students attending the magnet school who come from eligible (and served) attendance areas must receive Chapter 1 services in the magnet school because they reside in an eligible and served attendance area."

This same basic principle applies to private school students in the district:

> "Students attending non-public schools cannot receive Chapter 1 services unless they <u>reside</u> in <u>eligible and served</u> attendance areas. Students residing in eligible and served attendance areas but attending non-public schools must be served in that non-public school if the non-public school informs the LEA that it desires Chapter 1 services."

Thus, in this district the school attendance area retains its regular definition, but is never used to qualify magnet schools for Chapter 1. Rather, the magnet school is provided with Chapter 1 services in the same manner that non-public schools receive services.

Data collected during site visits for the case study on School Targeting (part of the National Assessment of Chapter 1) indicate another method of defining the school attendance area of magnet schools: the attendance area of the magnet school is defined as the entire school district. Technically, the poverty percentage for the magnet school attendance area in this instance would represent a weighted district average, which under certain circumstances could mean the magnet school would be unlikely to be designated as a Chapter 1 school. If, for example a district cannot serve all of its schools, a magnet school with it's poverty percent or count pegged to the district average would be unlikely to be served. This is only one possibility; the Chapter 1 regulations are replete with provisions for targeting additional schools that may not

qualify for Chapter 1 under normal circumstances. Researchers conducting the targeting study did find districts that had switched from using student residence to student enrollment due to the difficulties involved in the former process. Magnet schools were mentioned as part of the reason for these difficulties.

In sum, respondents in the nine districts in our study did not identify any problems in defining the school attendance areas of magnet schools, and in all cases reported that they are defined in the same manner as are those of all other schools in the district. However, information provided by the "pre-study district" as well as by other National Assessment researchers indicates that some districts do construct special definitions of school attendances areas to accommodate magnet schools. Next we turn to the broader issue of the method by which districts rank schools, using student enrollment versus place of residence.

Enrollment vs. Residence as Methods of Ranking Schools for Eligibility.

If enrollment is used, as is the case in three of the nine districts, we identified a number of scenarios that could occur to affect school targeting. We then proceeded to compare these potential scenarios against what we encountered as practice in the sampled districts. The possible scenarios are:

1. A magnet school is placed in a neighborhood heavily populated with minority children (who are more likely to be poor than are whites), and the school successfully attracts a large number of majority students. The school's percent of children in poverty could be reduced enough to cause the school to lose its status as a project school. This could occur because the school is no longer eligible, or because the school receives a lower ranking when the district is unable to serve all eligible schools;

2. A magnet school design does not alter the poverty composition enough to significantly affect the school's ranking, and there is no change in Chapter 1 status;

3. A magnet school is placed in a relatively high income neighborhood, and attracts poorer children from inner city schools, causing the school to become eligible for Chapter 1; or

4. Magnet schools district-wide result in a reduced variance between schools in poverty levels. A Chapter 1 provision permitting districts to serve all schools demonstrating "no-wide-variance" is used, thus all schools are Chapter 1 schools.

Respondents to our survey acknowledged the occurrence of two of the above scenarios. The first scenario described threatens to occur in one of the districts using enrollment to rank schools. One magnet school has fallen in rank from among the top 12 schools to the 37th school in a district where only 44 schools are currently served. Officials believe the school will soon become ineligible.

The second scenario indicating no change in Chapter 1 status, was reported by respondents in two districts using enrollment to rank schools. Respondents did not think schools in these districts had ever gained or lost Chapter 1 eligibility or project status due to a magnet school design. A respondent in one of these districts commented that in order for a school to gain or lose eligibility in that district, the school would have to be close to the borderline already.

The third and fourth scenarios, indicating that

(a) a magnet school gains Chapter 1 status, or

(b) all schools in a district become Chapter 1 project schools,

were not indicated by any respondents. This suggests that they may rarely occur in practice.

If student place of residence is used to rank schools, theoretically magnet schools should not change Chapter 1 status unless housing patterns in the district change substantially, or a particular approach is used to determine the school attendance area's poverty ranking. Respondents in some districts were confused on this topic; in one instance a Chapter 1 coordinator said that a particular magnet school had "gone on and off the Chapter 1 roles" as a result of higher income students transferring there. The magnet school specialist also indicated this to be the case. However, the Director of Federal and State projects in that district confirmed the fact that such an occurrence is not possible. It was concluded (after reiterating the question several times in many cases) that magnet schools in the study districts using student place of residence to rank schools did not lose or gain Chapter 1 status as a result of alterations in student composition.

Summary

The question of the effect of magnet schools on Chapter 1 school targeting resulted in a complex set of responses from the respondents in our sample. It is useful at this point to discuss these responses in a less distilled manner than the previous section provided.

The definition of a school attendance area used to rank schools for Chapter 1 eligibility was hypothesized to have some effect on whether magnet schools are targeted. While our hypothesis did not prove true in any of the nine study districts, we did find that the definition of a school attendance area of magnet schools may or may not differ from that of "regular" school attendance areas. It can differ in two ways. As in the case of the "pre-study" district, the magnet school can be ranked as though "no students reside in its attendance area," which in a practical sense renders the attendance area non-existent for purposes of targeting Chapter 1 schools. In such cases, it would appear to be unlikely for magnet schools to be designated as project schools without making use of special provisions in the Chapter 1 regulations, even though certain students in magnet schools can receive services. The decision to make use of the Chapter 1 provisions for serving these schools, such as the 25 Percent Rule, or the No Wide Variance provision, would have district-wide implications for the delivery of Chapter 1 services. A second way the definition of magnet school attendance areas may differ is that the entire district may technically be designated as the attendance area. This definition could also mean that magnet schools are unlikely to be designated as project schools without making use of special provisions in the regulations which, again have district-wide implications for Chapter 1. However, respondents in our nine sample districts did not indicate that their districts define attendance areas of magnet schools in any manner other than that applying to all other schools. Further, no respondent indicated any problems or conflicts arising with respect to school targeting as a result of the definition of school attendance areas of magnet schools. With this in mind, we shifted our attention to the broader issue of the method by which districts target Chapter 1 project schools.

In districts using enrollments to target, there is the potential for magnet schools to alter Chapter 1 school selection patterns. This potential was not realized in the study districts. There were no instances of schools actually losing Chapter 1 status, and only one instance of a school

receiving a lower ranking. (As previously noted, districts using residence for school ranking would not be affected by the presence of magnet schools.) Consequently, the effects of magnet school designs on Chapter 1 school targeting were of little concern to most respondents. Reasons for the lack of conflict between Chapter 1 school targeting and magnet schools in our districts reflect the limited extent to which magnet schools actually alter the poverty composition of these schools. Respondents in two of the districts using enrollment to target reported that magnet school designs did not alter the poverty concentration of schools <u>enough</u> to cause a change in Chapter 1 status.

A number of variables influence why magnet schools may not alter the poverty concentration enough to cause a school to lose Chapter 1 status or receive a lower ranking. Often these variables operate in concert. One variable is whether a court order to desegregate was imposed, and the degree of success involved. If a district is constantly monitoring the racial balance of all schools, overall student composition would not be expected to change substantially, regardless of other factors. Seven of nine study districts currently operate under a court order to desegregate.

A related variable is the speed with which magnet schools draw in children from other attendance areas. As one respondent indicated, while magnet schools do alter the poverty concentration of schools, they do so at a much slower rate than mandatory busing. Mandatory busing resulting from a desegregation method such as pairing, for example, can have a notable effect on the racial and economic balance of schools (Carsrud, 1984). Pairing combines the attendance areas of two or more schools and immediately changes the poverty concentration of the schools involved; the attendance areas selected are specifically chosen to maximize desegregation benefits. In essence, whatever effects magnet school designs have on school targeting most often occur with greater speed and intensity when district-wide forced busing occurs.

In addition, the poverty concentration may not be affected by magnet school development due to the type of magnet programs offered and the type of students they attract. For example, a magnet school specializing in vocational education or bilingual education may not be attractive to higher income families. A respondent in one district mentioned that there were objections to opening a vocational education magnet school because the black community felt the school would attract <u>only</u> black students. In another district, magnet schools are designed to attract mainly high achievers. Thus, if particular programs have greater appeal to families of a particular income level, the poverty composition of the school may not change enough to

affect Chapter 1 targeting. This could be especially true of districts not currently under a court order to desegregate.

It is also possible, as a researcher for the Resource Allocation Study noted, that district utilization of various Chapter 1 provisions such as no-wide-variance or the 25 percent rule, were in effect before the introduction of magnet schools. Thus, magnet schools would have no impact on school targeting. We did not collect data indicating use of these special provisions, and thus can only speculate that this may be the case.

In summary, the "worst case scenario," Chapter 1 magnet schools losing Chapter 1 status, is not of concern to respondents contacted for this study. Reasons for this lack of concern include 1) the fact that most districts use residence to rank schools, and 2) in those districts using the enrollment option, the speed with which and the degree to which student composition is actually altered in magnet schools is not great. One can surmise that when concern over loss of Chapter 1 status does arise, magnet schools in danger of losing their Chapter 1 status are not those schools exhibiting "greatest need," as their lowering rank on poverty would indicate. This could encourage officials in districts using student residence as a basis for ranking schools and who desire to implement magnet school plans to switch to the technically less complicated procedure of student enrollment. Next, we turn our attention to issues regarding student services.

Serving Students

Background

Students in greatest need of Chapter 1 services are required to be among those served, and are usually identified by a combination of indicators, primarily test scores and teacher judgement. Usually these children must attend Chapter 1 project schools. Evidence gathered as part of the Resource Allocation study suggests that the number of children enrolled in a school identified as needy roughly determines the amount of funding provided the school, and likewise the extent and type of Chapter 1 services. As noted in the section on school targeting, there are circumstances under which students in non-targeted schools can receive Chapter 1; students demonstrating need in private schools and in some cases (at least in the "prestudy" district) students in non-Chapter 1 magnet schools can receive services. (In the nine study districts, however, this does not appear to be the case.)*

Question and Findings

The research question originally posed was:

> In what ways are Chapter 1 services to needy students affected by magnet school designs?

In the nine districts, respondents identified three ways in which services to needy students in magnet schools are affected:

1. Chapter 1 services can diminish in amount or quality;

2. Loss of service can occur; or

3. A greater amount or higher quality of Chapter 1 service may be provided to needy students in magnet schools.

Diminished Services

All except one of the nine districts operate at least a few magnet schools that are Chapter 1 project schools.

---

* It is possible that there are such provisions in some of the nine study districts, but that respondents interviewed failed to be aware of them; as noted, Chapter 1 and magnet school officials are not always apprised of one another's policies.

Officials in two districts specifically expressed concern over the fact that when enough students who do not demonstrate need transfer into a Chapter 1 magnet school, the school loses money, and therefore services are affected. Loss of service could mean loss of FTE (full-time equivalent) Chapter 1 staff, or it can translate into an inability to purchase needed supplemental materials or fund field trips. One could argue that if there are fewer needy students, less Chapter 1 service is justified. However, many school officials would respond that less is never better when it involves the delivery of remedial services.

One respondent reported that services can also diminish if a Chapter 1 student in a regular project school transfers to a Chapter 1 magnet school in which there are fewer needy students than were in the residential school, and thus fewer Chapter 1 funds. As the respondent noted, "the child may receive remedial reading for only a fraction of the amount of time he or she received it before." However, as several respondents noted, students transferring to magnet schools are often the better students, who may be able to afford the loss.

In addition, one respondent noted that the quality of Chapter 1 service can diminish if a magnet program draws in too many students, causing overcrowding. This can cause difficulties if Chapter 1 uses pull out settings, for example. Beyond the Chapter 1 program itself, in another district, as well as in much of the literature, it was noted that the quality of the school's overall program can diminish if a nearby magnet school draws in the best students and staff from Chapter 1 schools.

Loss of Chapter 1 Services

Students can lose Chapter 1 services altogether if they transfer to ineligible magnet schools. Interestingly, in one district there is a policy prohibiting Chapter 1 students from transferring to non-Chapter 1 schools. While this would prevent total loss of service for the child, it would still be feasible for services to diminish if the child transferred to a Chapter 1 school with fewer resources, for example.

Several respondents voiced their concern over the dilemma of loss of services, many of them frustrated over the fact that the district does not provide for Chapter 1 services to "follow" children. One of the districts noted that at one time, when they received an ESAA grant, there was money and a provision contained in the grant to follow Chapter 1 students; currently there is no "follow the child" policy in any of the nine districts.

Some respondents noted various other forms of remedial services available to students losing Chapter 1 services. In one district, when students lose Chapter 1 services, a form of remedial instruction is provided with "desegregation funds" (not Chapter 1 money). Another respondent said that students losing Chapter 1 services can always receive SCE if they still qualify. A third response stated that "magnet schools attempt to 'make up the difference' on a child by child basis, (with individualized instruction) in order to sell magnet schools to parents." Finally, a somewhat less consoling thought was offered by one respondent, who commented that when students transfer to magnet schools and lose Chapter 1, "it was their own decision to transfer."

Needy Students Benefit

A magnet program can draw in enough needy students, to cause a project school to receive additional funding. This may translate into additional FTEs, materials, or field trips, for example. One respondent suggested this possibility, although no one mentioned this actually occurring.

Magnet schools can also benefit Chapter 1 students indirectly. As one respondent pointed out, the increased emphasis on quality education is likely to benefit all students in a school, indirectly if not directly. This respondent reports that the Chapter 1 population in magnet schools is slowly diminishing, and attributed this to high quality education.

Summary

Respondents in the nine study districts more often expressed concern about students losing or receiving diminished Chapter 1 instruction as a result of magnet school designs than about schools losing Chapter 1 status. In the case of students losing service altogether, a 1977 study conducted by the National Institute of Education, entitled "Implications of 'Follow the Child' Proposals," bears relevance. The study found that Title I regulations "provide considerable flexibility in selecting both eligible schools and participating students, so that many if not most of the students likely to be affected (by such changes) may, in fact, continue to be served." The Dougherty report states that "for the most part States and school districts appear to have continued the policies for selection of schools and children," (used under Title I), thus this flexibility still exists.

While none of the respondents alluded to the various sources of flexibility in the Chapter 1 regulations, it is probable these forces are at work in some districts. Further, they did mention local mechanisms to continue to help needy students with remedial instruction. Where disruptions in or discontinuations of Chapter 1 services do result, they appear not to be perceived by respondents as major problems.

Respondents' concerns regarding diminished services are somewhat inconsistent with findings of the Resource Allocation study, although not entirely so. Resource Allocation researchers report that most districts in their sample set strict Chapter 1 caseload levels for project schools. These requirements dictate the number of students assigned to a Chapter 1 teacher and the number of remedial sessions provided to a student. If caseload requirements are strictly enforced, Chapter 1 services should not diminish as a result of reduced Chapter 1 allocations or as a result of overcrowding. However, not <u>all</u> districts set caseload requirements for Chapter 1 schools, and when such requirements are in effect the degree to which they are enforced is currently an unanswered question. Any future analysis of the effects of magnet school designs on the delivery of Chapter 1 services to needy students should include careful attention to the method by which Chapter 1 resources are allocated in districts.

Overall, respondents in the nine districts indicated that the merits of magnet schools for students outweigh any problems caused with respect to delivery of Chapter 1 services.

Comparability

Background

The comparability requirement was designed to insure that State and local expenditures at each Chapter 1 project school are roughly the same as the district-wide average for all non-project schools. In other words, district officials are required to equalize per pupil expenditures between all schools prior to the receipt of federal Chapter 1 funds. According to a large scale study of Chapter 1 district level practices, commonly referred to as the "District Practices Study," the procedures necessary to determine, maintain, and document comparability under Title I were perceived by many as overly burdensome (Advanced Technologies, Inc., 1983). Consequently, Chapter 1 requires only that districts provide comparability assurances and maintain sufficient data at the district level to show evidence of implementation of these policies. The assurances provide for a "district-wide salary schedule; a policy to assure equivalency among schools in teachers, administrators, and auxiliary personnel, and a policy to assure equivalence among schools in the provision of curriculum materials and supplies (Dougherty, 1985)." Districts are allowed a certain percent difference among schools, the exact percentage determined by state or district officials. Federal regulations no longer state the variance allowed, although an informal rule of 10 percent is used as a guide in reviewing district practices. While some districts as a result of state or district determination still carry out the same reporting procedures with respect to comparability as they did under Title I, other districts opt to provide assurances (which they are also expected to implement).

Magnet schools, in offering various special programs, often require additional staff and equipment, and involve transporting some students farther than if they attended their neighborhood school. The most recent data available on the cost of magnet schools indicates that:

- "The average total cost per student in magnet schools was approximately $200 more than nonmagnets in 1980-81, but the cost declined to only $59 more on average in 1981-82 (a drop partially attributable to higher initial "start up" costs of magnet schools); and

- The cost items accounting for slightly higher magnet costs are average salary per classroom teacher for secondary magnets and pupil transportation for elementary and secondary magnets." (James H. Lowry and Associates, 1983)

Thus arises the concern over comparability. Briefly stated, the greater resources involved in magnet schools may deter districts from adopting these programs for fear of running afoul of the comparability requirement. A recent report to the Committee on Education and Labor recommended that Congress "should direct NIE* to examine whether maintaining comparability is a problem in LEAs operating magnet schools..." (Dougherty, 1985).

The Department of Education (ED) prepared an internal, undated document in response to the Dougherty report on changes under Chapter 1 of ECIA. The document specifically addresses the suggestion that NIE (now OERI) conduct such a study:

> While we do not object to NIE examining this issue, the need for an examination is not clear. Magnet schools are currently exempt from inclusion in an LEA's comparability determinations. ED's interpretation of the statute is that any school which does not have an exclusive attendance area may be omitted from comparability determinations. Schools which receive students without regard to attendance area - magnet schools, schools for handicapped children - need not be included in the computation of the district-wide level of services. If a magnet school, however, is designated as a Chapter 1 school under the provisions of Section 556(d)(2) of ECIA, it would have to meet the comparability requirements of Section 558(c)(2). No statutory or regulatory change is needed. We plan to reiterate ED's policy on comparability as it applies to schools without an exclusive attendance area in the next issuance of our nonregulatory guidance.**

---

* As of October 1985, NIE was reorganized into the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

** The guidance in this document pertains to the Chapter 1 program providing financial assistance to LEAs for projects designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children and children in local institutions for neglected or delinquent children.

The existence of this ED interpretation on the issue of magnet schools and the Chapter 1 comparability provision came to our attention after interviews for this study were conducted. Interestingly, no respondent indicated any knowledge of the ED interpretation outlined above. Currently there is no official guidance provided to states which provides this information. Furthermore, we obtained a draft report of the new Nonregulatory Guidance, which has not yet been issued to states, and it does not contain any reference to the fact that schools which receive students without regard to attendance area need not be included in computation of the district-wide level of services.

Question and Findings

The following research question was posed:

- Is the Chapter 1 comparability provision an impediment to magnet schools?

Many respondents were basically unfamiliar with the intricacies of comparability requirements, especially as they relate to magnet schools. To gather complete and reliable information on how comparability requirements affect magnet school development, it would be necessary to conduct interviews with the individuals who actually perform the calculations or write and monitor the assurances. In the one district where such an individual was questioned on a particular item, he was somewhat distrustful of the purpose and intent of the question. The findings presented here provide insight into perceptions of Chapter 1 and magnet school personnel on this issue, as well as define more precisely the areas of concern.

There were no reports of any district written guidelines specifically referring to comparability and magnet schools. In all except one of the nine districts, we were told that non-Chapter 1 magnet schools are entered into the district average comparison base in the same fashion as are all other schools. In one district, a respondent reported that extra or special programs in non-Chapter 1 schools do cause occasional comparability problems, but he could not elaborate on the topic.

Respondents were also asked whether comparability concerns affect the selection of which schools become magnet schools. We had hypothesized that if all magnet schools in a district were also Chapter 1 project schools, none of them would enter into the district average comparison base. However, no respondents indicated that comparability considerations in any way influenced the decision of which schools would become magnet schools. When magnet schools are located in Chapter 1 attendance areas, respondents reported it is because heavily

minority-dominated schools are those most in need of desegregating.

Summary

A number of factors at work in the nine districts mitigate against conflicts between Chapter 1's comparability provision and magnet school development. They include the following:

- The relatively small number of magnet schools compared to the total number of nonproject schools - For example, if out of 50 schools not served by Chapter 1, four schools offer a magnet program, it seems unlikely that the per pupil expenditures or extra equipment involved would significantly affect the district average comparison base. This is because the extra resources are so minimal and because so few schools have these extra resources. Respondents were questioned on this but most seemed not to have thought about the comparability issue in this manner. Further, as noted, districts are permitted a certain amount of difference between schools. In three instances this leeway was cited as relevant to additional resources used by magnet schools. As one respondent noted, "the school (even though it receives extra resources) still falls within ± 15 percent of the district average."

- The fact that monies expended on magnet programs are frequently from federal sources and are therefore not reported for purposes of comparability - The funding source used to finance magnet schools was mentioned by respondents in two districts as one factor contributing to a lack of comparability problems. If magnet schools are financed with federal desegregation funds (Chapter 2 and the Magnet School Assistance Act were mentioned by respondents in four districts), the cost of additional resources is not covered by state or local money. If the extra resources are not purchased with state or local money, the balance among schools of state and local expenditures is not upset. As one respondent commented, comparability is not challenged by magnet schools because

their costs may be tied to federally-funded desegregation efforts. One respondent specifically noted that all desegregation-related funds are excluded from comparability calculations. (The respondent knew this to be the case but was not sure of the basis on which this practice occurs.) In comparison, regular schools with enhancement programs that are financed in part if not totally with local money, would cause difficulty with respect to comparability. These schools are not necessarily magnet schools. They are created when districts attempt to compensate students in schools which cannot be desegregated.* While the respondent from one district that indicated occasional comparability problems resulting from magnet programs could not elaborate on these problems, we suspect it may have been linked to the fact that the district reported no federal funds assisting its desegregation efforts.

- The fact that some districts preempt potential comparability problems by allocating more resources to Chapter 1 schools than to non-Chapter 1 schools - The Chapter 1 coordinator in a district participating in the Resource Allocation Study reported that his district uses a different formula to allocate instructional staff to Chapter 1 project schools than it does to non-project schools; Chapter 1 schools have a higher teacher-pupil ratio. This helps balance out any difference in instructional staff between Chapter 1 schools and magnet schools. It is unclear, however, whether district officials were making a conscious effort to avoid comparability problems.

---

* These schools have been termed in some districts as "Compensatory Education" schools. The concept of such schools is based on a Supreme Court decision, Milliken v. Bradley, which allows school districts to maintain all minority schools that have been proven impossible to desegregate if additional resources are expended on those students.

Many respondents observed that the main difference between regular and magnet schools in terms of additional resources is one of smaller class size. A related consideration is the fact that some magnet programs such as "Extended Day" require parents to pay extra money for the service of caring for a child before and after the regular school day ends. In one district, parents pay for transportation to and from magnet schools if the child must travel to a different attendance area. In these instances, the additional resources are paid for by parents, not state and local funds.

- The fact that some districts avoid comparability problems by placing magnet programs in a different grade span than applies to the provision of Chapter 1 services, thus avoiding the need to make comparability comparisons - In one of the nine study districts, Chapter 1 serves only students in grades K-3, while all desegregation efforts, including magnet programs, are offered only to students in grades 4 and above. Since comparability allows comparisons involving only the grade span served by Chapter 1, resources related to magnet programs would not be included in the comparison base in this district. Respondents in this district however, reported that this arrangement was not motivated by the Chapter 1 comparability requirement.

- The fact that in some districts, all magnet programs are located in Chapter 1 attendance areas - This is essentially the case in one of the nine districts, where all schools offering magnet programs to students in the grade span served by Chapter 1 are project schools. In such a situation, the additional resources are placed in Chapter 1 schools, and therefore do not enter into the district average comparison base in comparability computations. A respondent in this district stated that this arrangement was not motivated by concerns over comparability requirements.

In summary, respondents in the nine districts did not view comparability requirements as an impediment to magnet school development. Although there is an official ED interpretation of the comparability requirement as it relates to magnet schools, no respondent reported knowledge of it. A respondent in one district reported excluding magnet schools from comparability calculations, but it was not done for the reason outlined in the ED interpretation. In the absence of knowledge of this interpretation, respondents were able to identify a number of factors that minimized conflicts between the comparability provision and magnet school development.

Desegregation

Background

Another question posed at the beginning of this study involves the interface between Chapter 1 and mandatory desegregation. Because compensatory education and desegregation unfolded contemporaneously over the past 20 years, concerns have frequently arisen about the impacts one has upon the other. In fact, certain flexibility provisions in Title I such as the grandfather clause and the option to continue services to a child transferred mid-year found part of their justification in concerns emanating from potential conflicts between these two policies. Many observers have pointed out an inherent contradiction in the two policies: one aims at reducing the concentration of minority students, many of whom are from lower SES backgrounds, while the other focuses on providing extra resources to students attending schools with higher poverty concentrations.

Magnet schools are but one means of remedying patterns of racial isolation. Others include redrawing school attendance areas and pairing schools. Considerable debate surrounds the question as to how effective magnet schools are in achieving school desegregation. Clearly they are viewed as a more palatable approach than busing by most citizens and parents, but their ability to reorder district-wide patterns of racial concentration is more dubious. Given this historical picture, it appeared important to document whether desegregation efforts in the sample districts posed similar or different issues when aligned with Chapter 1 programs.

Questions and Findings

The research question posed was:

- Are the problems uncovered with respect to magnet schools and the Chapter 1 unique to magnet schools, or are they present in other types of desegregation efforts as well?

Of the nine districts contacted, seven reported operating under a court order to desegregate. Most court orders were imposed in the 1970s. Six of the seven court order districts use busing along with magnet schools as a vehicle to achieve integrated school settings. Methods of desegregation requiring forced busing include school clustering or pairing. Some districts also require human relations training as part of the desegregation plan. One district respondent observed that

busing was on the decline in that district, although in others the effort appears massive. For example, in one district 50 percent of the students are bussed.

In spite of these numerous efforts at desegregation, few respondents could identify specific problems or effects related to the co-existence of Chapter 1 and desegregation activities. In three districts, respondents noted that children involved in desegregation could lose Chapter 1 services by transferring to an ineligible school but in only one of those districts was the respondent certain that this had actually happened. None of the nine sample districts reported special procedures or guidelines for schools involved in desegregation. Two respondents from different districts observed that Chapter 1 and desegregation were two parallel, independent efforts that resulted in little to no conflict. In one district, changing housing patterns and desegregation led to a considerable decline in the student population in the late 1970s. Consequently, the district was able to increase the number of Chapter 1 project schools.

It appears from this inquiry that Chapter 1 problems attributed to desegregation (and vice versa) are not substantially <u>different</u> problems from those involving magnet schools. However, there is a difference in the speed with which other forms of desegregation tend to bring about changes in school composition and attendance areas. Furthermore, because our sample of districts had been desegregating for some time, the issues related to Chapter 1 services may have been resolved or muted in their significance by the time we asked our questions. Moreover, the respondents contacted in the sample may not have known the larger issues, present or past, affecting desegregation and compensatory education, given their operational roles--administration of magnet schools and management of Chapter 1 programs. Thus, one cannot conclude that important inter-relationships do not exist between desegregation efforts beyond the magnet schools component. Rather, these dynamics may require a different mode of inquiry (e.g., more longitudinal and on-site visits) and the use of different respondents than was possible in this study.

Other Program Interactions

Some questions asked of respondents provided information on the interaction of the Chapter 1 program and magnet schools that did not focus directly on either targeting schools or serving students. The responses to these queries are presented below.

One hypothesis we considered while developing the survey instrument concerns changes in the regulations when Congress modified Title I by enacting Chapter 1. We hypothesized the greater amount of record keeping required under Title I may have posed some or additional difficulties with respect to magnet school designs than does Chapter 1. For example, Chapter 1 eliminated the Title I requirement for comparability reporting, resulting in a significant reduction in required paperwork. Conceivably then, comparability could have posed more of an impediment to magnet school development under Title I than under Chapter 1, especially since the concept of magnet schools was a relatively new one. We were also interested in other ways respondents thought the change to Chapter 1 made any difference with respect to magnet school development.

Almost all districts had at least a couple of magnet schools before Chapter 1 was enacted. No respondent could identify any area in which the enactment of Chapter 1 made a difference for magnet schools. Other factors did seem to change but these were unrelated to the change from Title I to Chapter 1. For example, a respondent in one district noted that record keeping regarding magnet schools is more difficult now because more students transfer out of their regular attendance area. Another respondent commented that their state did not ease up on any reporting requirements after the enactment of Chapter 1.

When asked whether there were any (other) difficulties implementing magnet school designs brought on by the existence of Chapter 1, respondents in six of the nine districts identified none. However, in one district, the necessity to "sell" non-Chapter 1 magnet schools to parents of Chapter 1 students was noted; in this district Chapter 1 is viewed as an asset to magnet schools. In another district, the opposite occurs. Because Chapter 1 denotes educational deprivation, parents of non-Chapter 1 students have been known to send in written requests that their children not participate in Chapter 1. Further, in one district there is an occasional technical problem related to scheduling. Since Chapter 1 students are required to participate in a certain amount of remedial instruction each day, their schedules may not allow enough flexibility for them to participate fully in a magnet program.

To turn this question around, respondents were asked whether there were any difficulties implementing the Chapter 1 program caused by magnet school designs. As noted many respondents expressed concern over Chapter 1 services not "following" students who transfer. Otherwise, two respondents

pointed out that magnet schools are often crowded schools. This was noted as a problem particularly where Chapter 1 instruction is provided in a pull-out setting.

We also wondered whether the receipt of extra or special services through one of these programs (Chapter 1 or magnet schools) could affect eligibility for the other program. It was hypothesized that there might exist a propensity to restrict children's receipt of "double" services when resources are limited. We found that where student eligibility was affected, it was not the result of an attempt to prevent "double" service, but rather a result of the programs serving two different populations. For example, if the entrance requirements of a magnet school or program within a school include high test scores, Chapter 1 children are not likely to be accepted. In another district, a few magnet schools accepted only students in need of remedial instruction who do not qualify for Chapter 1.

Finally, we were interested in whether Chapter 1 purchased equipment or other resources enhancing the school environment were ever used to help "create" a magnet school. Many respondents perceived this question as one an auditor might ask, and consequently most responses were short and to the point. For example, one respondent replied "no, that would be supplanting." Most answers consisted a simple "no" although respondents in two districts indicated the presence of Chapter 1 helped make a magnet school more attractive than the regular school through the provision of full-day kindergarten and after school assistance. However, they did not view Chapter 1 funds as helping "create" the magnet school.

REFERENCES

Advanced Technologies. Local Operation of Title I, ESEA 1976 - 1982: A Resource Book. Final report submitted to the Planning and Evaluation Service, U.S. Department of Education, June 1983.

Blank, Rolf K., Dentler, Robert A., Baltzell, D. Catherine, and Chabotar, Kent. Survey of Magnet Schools: Analyzing a Model for Quality Integrated Education. Final Report of a National Study for the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation, September 1983.

Carsrud, Karen Banks. Does Pairing Schools Hurt Chapter 1 Students? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (68th, New Orleans, LA, April 1984.

Dougherty, John C. Report on Changes Under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act. Prepared for the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, United States House of Representatives, September 1985.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Education. Implications of "Follow-The-Child" Proposals. Washington, D.C., November 29, 1977.

APPENDIX A

Date _____
Name _____
Respondent _____
Title _____
District _____

CHAPTER 1 AND MAGNET SCHOOLS

I. Overview

A. When did your magnet program begin? (During what school year was the 1st magnet school program in operation?)

B. When were the most recent magnet schools created?

C. Do you currently have plans to expand or reduce your magnet program?

1. If so, why?

D. What type of magnet programs do you have (what are the school level programs)--i.e., what makes them attractive?

(Do not get school by school listing, just different types)

E. Where do you place magnet schools? Urban fringe areas? Inner city schools? Suburban? Other?

1. Is the existence of Chapter 1 or other programs in any way considered?

F. What student selection criteria are used in your magnet program?

1. race/ethnicity?

   - what are racial quotas?
   - how long do you have to reach goals?

2. grades?
3. test scores?
4. disciplinary history?
5. others?
6. (if more than one criteria) which criteria is given the most weight?

G. Are the student selection criteria the same for all magnet schools?

H. Who decides what racial quotas to apply?

I. How often and what procedures are used to monitor these quota requirements?

J. Are Chapter 1 funds or services ever used to create a magnet school (by way of focusing on Chapter 1 purchased additional resources, equipment)? How does this work?

K. Did you have magnet schools before Title 1 became Chapter 1? Did the greater regulatory procedures and record keeping of Title 1 cause problems with regard to magnet development?

L. Have there been any difficulties implementing your magnet school plan that were caused by the existence of Chapter 1 services?

M. Have there been any difficulties with providing Chapter 1 services that were caused by the existence of a magnet school program in your district?

N. Why did your district choose a magnet plan as opposed to or in addition to another form of desegregation?

1. Did the existence of Chapter 1 services in your district influence your decision in any way?

II. School Level Issues

A. Are schools in your district ranked for Chapter 1 purposes using student enrollment or place of residence as a basis for ranking?

B. Are magnet schools ranked any differently from all other schools?

C. Do you have any written guidelines regarding Chapter 1 services in magnet schools?

D. Have you received any questions from principals or other administrators regarding Chapter 1 services in magnet schools?

1. If so, what is the nature of the questions?

E. Does the district have any special funding sources to use for magnet schools development?

Probe: Local comp. ed., Federal Chapter 2 money

F. Do magnet schools use district resources over and above those used by non-magnets--with regard to:

- PPE?
- Teachers salary?
- Transportation?
- Equipment?
- Building improvements?
- Other?

1. If yes to any of the above, is this mainly due to "start up" costs, or are additional resources required on an ongoing basis?

2. Do you have any means of documenting the cost of magnet schools compared to other schools?

G. Do you know of any instance in which a school gained or lost Chapter 1 funding because it adopted a magnet program?

If yes, explain.

III. Student Level Issues

A. Does the receipt of special services through a magnet program affect a student's eligibility for Chapter 1?

Probe: If a child is already receiving extra/special services, does that make him/her ineligible for Chapter 1?

1. Conversely, does the receipt of Chapter 1 services affect eligibility for participating in a magnet school?

B. Do Chapter 1 services follow the child if the child moves to an ineligible school from a school that was served?

1. Can you send me your guidelines on this policy?

2. Is the policy the same for magnet schools?

IV. Comparability Issues

A. Do you have any special guidelines (written or unwritten) regarding the Chapter 1 comparability requirements and magnet vs. non-magnet schools?

1. Have any questions ever been raised on this issue?

2. If yes, what is the nature of the questions?

Probe: technical issues?

B. Are magnet schools that are not Chapter 1 schools included in the district average comparison base (for comparability purposes) in the same fashion as are other non-Chapter 1 schools?

1. (If these magnets do go into comparison base) In light of the number of schools in your district, do you know if the magnet schools make a noticeable difference in the comparison base? How much?

2. If yes, is there enough of a difference that you are required to increase resources in the Chapter 1 schools (to make them comparable to the non-Chapter 1 magnets)?

C. Do comparability concerns affect the selection of which schools become magnet schools in any way?

Probe: Are magnets more likely to be placed in Chapter 1 attendance areas?

D. Aside from the technical comparability of Chapter 1 requirements, does any resentment exist in your community over inequality of magnet schools and non-magnet schools?

1. If so, was anything done/is anything planned to alleviate this resentment? What?

Probe: Were any compensatory education schools created/do you have plans to create any to help alleviate community resentment? (PG County)

a. If so, what funding sources were/will be used?

V. Magnet Schools and Desegregation in General

The following questions are designed to determine whether magnet schools present special considerations concerning Chapter 1 that are different from those considerations raised by other desegregation efforts?

A. Is your magnet school program one component of a larger desegregation plan?

If so, briefly describe the other components. If not skip to G.

B. How are schools in the procress of desegregating which are ranked for Chapter 1 purposes?

C. Do you have any written guidelines regarding Chapter 1 services in desegregating schools?

(If so, please send)

D. Does the district have any special funds for schools in the process of desegregating (other than magnets)?

E. Do desegregating schools (other than magnets) use district resources over and above those used by schools not in thep rocess of desegregating--with regard to:

- PPE?
- Teachers salary?
- Transportation?
- Equipment
- Building improvements?
- Other?

1. Do you have any means of documenting the cost of desegregating schools versus schools which are not in the process of desegregating?

F. Do you know of any instance in which a school in the process of desegregating (other than a magnet) gained or lost Chapter 1 service because it was in the process of desegregating?

1. What were the reasons?

G. In your opinion, do desegregation efforts and the Chapter 1 program conflict with one another or complement each other?

H. Which efforts (desegregation or Chapter 1) do you feel will have the greatest impact on children in the long run?

I. Are ther any issues especially relevant to the relationship between Chapter 1 and magnet schools that I have not mentioned? If so, what?

Finally, do you have the name and title of someone responsible for overseeing your magnet schools programs.

Name _____
Title _____
Phone _____

Thank respondent.

Remind respondent to send materials referred to in Questions (II.C, III.B.1, IV.A).

Remind him/her you will send mini-questionnaire.

APPENDIX B

CHAPTER 1 NATIONAL ASSESSMENT MINI-QUESTIONNAIRE

1. For school year 1985-86, write in the number of public schools in your district and the number in which Chapter 1 services were offered in each category.

Type of Public School	Number of Public Schools in District	Number of Public Schools with Chapter 1 Services
Public elementary schools	_____	_____
Public middle or junior high schools	_____	_____
Public high schools	_____	_____
Public combined elementary-secondary schools	_____	_____

2. For the school year 1985-86, write in the number of magnet schools in your district, and the number in which Chapter 1 services were offered in each category.

Type of Public School	Number of Magnet Schools in District	Number of Magnet Schools with Chapter 1 Services
Public elementary schools	_____	_____
Public middle or junior high schools	_____	_____
Public high schools	_____	_____
Public combined elementary-secondary schools	_____	_____

3. For the school year 1985-86, write in the number of schools included in your desegregation plan, the number of those that are magnet schools and the number of those in which Chapter 1 services are available.

Type of Public School	Number of Schools in Desegregation Plan	Number of Schools in Desegregation Plan that are magnet Schools	Number of Schools in Desegregation Plan in which Chapter 1 Services are Available
Public elementary schools	_____	_____	_____
Public middle or junior high schools	_____	_____	_____
Public high schools	_____	_____	_____
Public combined elementary-secondary schools	_____	_____	_____

4. For school year 1985-86, provide counts of the district enrollment and the public and nonpublic school students served by Chapter 1. Provide unduplicated counts.

(If no nonpublic school students were served in school year 1985-86, leave the nonpublic column below blank.)

Enrollment in Public Schools in the District in School Year 1985-86	Public School Students Served by Chapter 1 in School Year 1985-86	Non-public School Students Served by Chapter 1 in School Year 1985-86
(Pre-K through 12)	(Pre-K through 12)	(Pre-K through 12)
_____	_____	_____

5. For school year 1985-86, approximately what percent of the students residing in your district were limited-English proficient? Write in your answer.

_____ percent

6. What was the total amount of expenditures for the district as a whole (from all sources) for the last (1985-86) school year? Write in your answer.

$_____

7. What is the total Chapter 1 allocation (including carry-over funds) for the current (1985-86) school year?

$_____

8. Did your district ever receive an ESAA (Emergency School Aid Act) grant? ___

If so, when _____

9. Is your district currently under a court order to desegregate? _____

If so, when did the court order go into effect? _____

APPENDIX C

Summary Profile of Sample Districts
School Year 1985-86

District[a]	Public School Enrollment	Percent Minority Enrolled (Public Schools)	Number of Non-Magnet Schools	Number of Magnet Schools	State Compensatory Education[b]	Public School Students Served by Chapter 1	School Targeting Method[c]	Total Chapter 1 Allocation (includes carry over)	Grade Levels Served by Chapter 1	Chapter 1 Serves: Percent of Non-Magnets	Chapter 1 Serves: Percent of Magnets
A	31,525	55%	23	23	Yes	12,696	R	$ 3,710,028	K-12	61%	44%
B	58,727	62%	104	5	No	8,532	R	$ 8,169,888	pre K-12	58%	40%
C	31,018	68%	22	27	Yes	6,769	R	$ 4,229,189	K-10	73%	22%
D	44,099	35%	74	15	No	5,519	E	$ 4,074,215	K-10	36%	40%
E	55,520	52%	88	9	Yes	7,239	E	$ 6,280,000	K-8	56%	22%
F	106,650	23%	121	27	No	15,000	R	$16,095,084	K-10	66%	56%
G	128,091	79%	165	23	Yes	13,004	R	$13,595,448	K-3	37%	0%
H	45,434	56%	56	20	Yes	5,470	E	$11,173,140	K-8	59%	70%
I	91,638	30%	126	18	Yes	3,100	R	$ 2,732,307	K-6	8%	78%

a/ All districts serve grades K-12.
b/ State Compensatory Education Program.
c/ R = residence.
E = enrollment.

APPENDIX D

District	Region	Number of Public Schools	Number of Public Schools With Chapter 1 Services	Number of Magnet Schools	Number of Magnet Schools With Chapter 1 Services
A	West	Elementary	35	18	21 10
		Middle/Junior...	6	3	2 0
		High Schools ...	5	3	0 0
		Combined Elementary/ Secondary	0	0	0 0

Federal funding for magnet schools:	Public School Enrollment (1985-86) pre-K through 12 ...	1985-86 Percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...
Chapter 2	31,525	55%
1980-81 percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...	Percent of students residing in district who were limited-English proficient (1985-86) ...	Public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...
50%	10%	12,696
Non-public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...	Total district expenditures (1985-86) ...	Total Chapter 1 allocation (including carry-over funds, (1985-86) ...
251	$111,000,000	$3,710,028
Targetting schools for Chapter 1:	Chapter 1 services follow children to ineligible schools?	State compensatory education program?
Student Place of Residence	No	Yes
ESAA Grant?	Current court order to desegregate?	Does bussing take place?
1980-83	Yes	Yes, at secondary level only

District	Region	Number of Public Schools	Number of Public Schools With Chapter 1 Services	Number of Magnet Schools	Number of Magnet Schools With Chapter 1 Services
B	North-west	Elementary	81	47	2 1
		Middle/Junior...	17	10	0 0
		High Schools ...	10	5	3 1
		Combined Elementary/ Secondary	1	0	0 0

Federal funding for magnet schools:	Public School Enrollment (1985-86) pre-K through 12 ...	1985-86 Percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...
Magnet School Assistance Act	58,727	62%

1980-81 percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...	Percent of students residing in district who were limited-English proficient (1985-86) ...	Public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...
60%	15%	8,532

Non-public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...	Total district expenditures (1985-86) ...	Total Chapter 1 allocation (including carry-over funds, (1985-86) ...
250	$246,713,434	$8,169,888

Targetting schools for Chapter 1:	Chapter 1 services follow children to ineligible schools?	State compensatory education program?
Student Place of Residence	No	No

ESAA Grant?	Current court order to desegregate?	Does bussing take place?
1981	Yes	Yes

District	Region	Number of Public Schools	Number of Public Schools With Chapter 1 Services	Number of Magnet Schools	Number of Magnet Schools With Chapter 1 Services
C	Mid-west	Elementary	38	19	18 5
		Middle/Junior...	6	3	4 1
		High Schools ...	5	0	5 0
		Combined Elementary/ Secondary	0	0	0 0

Federal funding for magnet schools:	Public School Enrollment (1985-86) pre-K through 12 ...	1985-86 Percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...
Chapter 2	31,018	68%
1980-81 percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...	Percent of students residing in district who were limited-English proficient (1985-86) ...	Public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...
64%	1%	6,769
Non-public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...	Total district expenditures (1985-86) ...	Total Chapter 1 allocation (including carry-over funds, (1985-86) ...
64	$125,000,000	$4,229,189
Targetting schools for Chapter 1:	Chapter 1 services follow children to ineligible schools?	State compensatory education program?
Student Place of Residence	No	Yes
ESAA Grant?	Current court order to desegregate?	Does bussing take place?
1976	Yes	No

District	Region	Number of Public Schools	Number of Public Schools With Chapter 1 Services	Number of Magnet Schools	Number of Magnet Schools With Chapter 1 Services
D	South-west	Elementary	63	25	11 6
		Middle/Junior...	17	8	3 0
		High Schools ...	9	0	1 0
		Combined Elementary/ Secondary	0	0	0 0

Federal funding for magnet schools:	Public School Enrollment (1985-86) pre-K through 12 ...	1985-86 Percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...
None	44,099	35%
1980-81 percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...	Percent of students residing in district who were limited-English proficient (1985-86) ...	Public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...
32%	.5%	5,519
Non-public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...	Total district expenditures (1984-85) ...	Total Chapter 1 allocation (including carry-over funds, (1985-86) ...
159	$132,000,000*	$4,074,215
Targetting schools for Chapter 1:	Chapter 1 services follow children to ineligible schools?	State compensatory education program?
Student Enrollment	No	No
ESAA Grant?	Current court order to desegregate?	Does bussing take place?
1974-75 through 1979-80	No	None

* Figure is for 1984-85.

District	Region	Number of Public Schools	Number of Public Schools With Chapter 1 Services	Number of Magnet Schools	Number of Magnet Schools With Chapter 1 Services
E	South-east	Elementary	64	43	5 2
		Middle/Junior...	18	8	2 0
		High Schools ...	15	0	2 0
		Combined Elementary/ Secondary	0	0	0 0

Federal funding for magnet schools:	Public School Enrollment (1985-86) pre-K through 12 ...	1985-86 Percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...
None	55,520	52%
1980-81 percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...	Percent of students residing in district who were limited-English proficient (1985-86) ...	Public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...
45%	2%	7,239
Non-public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...	Total district expenditures (1985-86) ...	Total Chapter 1 allocation (including carry-over funds, (1985-86) ...
200	$190,353,133	$6,280,000
Targetting schools for Chapter 1:	Chapter 1 services follow children to ineligible schools?	State compensatory education program?
Student Enrollment	No	Yes
ESAA Grant?	Current court order to desegregate?	Does bussing take place?
1982-83	Yes	Yes

District	Region	Number of Public Schools	Number of Public Schools With Chapter 1 Services	Number of Magnet Schools	Number of Magnet Schools With Chapter 1 Services
F	South-east	Elementary	99 .... 78	13	10
		Middle/Junior...	35 .... 15	6	3
		High Schools ...	14 .... 2	8	2
		Combined Elementary/ Secondary	0 .... 0	0	0

Federal funding for magnet schools:	Public School Enrollment (1985-86) pre-K through 12 ...	1985-86 Percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...
No	106,650	23%

1980-81 percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...	Percent of students residing in district who were limited-English proficient (1985-86) ...	Public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...
23%	1%	15,000

Non-public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...	Total district expenditures (1985-86) ...	Total Chapter 1 allocation (including carry-over funds, (1985-86) ...
No answer	$294,962,567	$16,095,084

Targetting schools for Chapter 1:	Chapter 1 services follow children to ineligible schools?	State compensatory education program?
Student Place of Residence	No	No

ESAA Grant?	Current court order to desegregate?	Does bussing take place?
No	Yes	Yes

District	Region	Number of Public Schools	Number of Public Schools With Chapter 1 Services	Number of Magnet Schools	Number of Magnet Schools With Chapter 1 Services
G	South-west	Elementary	127	60	5 0
		Middle/Junior...	25	0	8 0
		High Schools ...	35	0	9 0
		Combined Elementary/ Secondary	1	0	1 0

Federal funding for magnet schools:	Public School Enrollment (1985-86) pre-K through 12 ...	1985-86 Percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...
Magnet School Assistance Act	128,091	79%
1980-81 percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...	Percent of students residing in district who were limited-English proficient (1985-86) ...	Public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...
73%	No answer	13,004
Non-public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...	Total district expenditures (1985-86) ...	Total Chapter 1 allocation (including carry-over funds, (1985-86) ...
351	$584,131,855	$13,595,448
Targetting schools for Chapter 1:	Chapter 1 services follow children to ineligible schools?	State compensatory education program?
Student Place of Residence	No	Yes
ESAA Grant?	Current court order to desegregate?	Does bussing take place?
1981	Yes	Yes, but its use is on the decline

District	Region	Number of Public Schools	Number of Public Schools With Chapter 1 Services	Number of Magnet Schools	Number of Magnet Schools With Chapter 1 Services
H	North-east	Elementary	56	45	14 14
		Middle/Junior...	0	0	0 0
		High Schools ...	12	0	6 0
		Combined Elementary/ Secondary	8	2	0 0

Federal funding for magnet schools:	Public School Enrollment (1985-86) pre-K through 12 ...	1985-86 Percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...
No (however State funding is provided)	45,434	56%
1980-81 percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...	Percent of students residing in district who were limited-English proficient (1985-86) ...	Public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...
54%	\$3.1%	5,470
Non-public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...	Total district expenditures (1985-86) ...	Total Chapter 1 allocation (including carry-over funds, (1985-86) ...
130	\$206,140,000	\$11,173,140
Targetting schools for Chapter 1:	Chapter 1 services follow children to ineligible schools?	State compensatory education program?
Student Place of Residence	No	Yes
ESAA Grant?	Current court order to desegregate?	Does bussing take place?
1975-76 through 1980-81	Yes	Yes

District	Region	Number of Public Schools	Number of Public Schools With Chapter 1 Services	Number of Magnet Schools	Number of Magnet Schools With Chapter 1 Services
I	North-east	Elementary	102	24	16 14
		Middle/Junior...	22	0	1 0
		High Schools ...	20	0	1 0
		Combined Elementary/ Secondary	0	0	0 0

Federal funding for magnet schools:	Public School Enrollment (1985-86) pre-K through 12 ...	1985-86 Percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...
No	91,638	30%
1980-81 percent minority students enrolled (public schools) ...	Percent of students residing in district who were limited-English proficient (1985-86) ...	Public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...
24%	5%	3,100
Non-public school students served by Chapter 1 (1985-86), pre-K through 12 ...	Total district expenditures (1985-86) ...	Total Chapter 1 allocation (including carry-over funds, (1985-86) ...
114	$436,947,735	$2,732,307
Targetting schools for Chapter 1:	Chapter 1 services follow children to ineligible schools?	State compensatory education program?
Student Enrollment	No	Yes
ESAA Grant?	Current court order to desegregate?	Does bussing take place?
No	No	No

APPENDIX E

District Profiles

General profiles of the nine districts in the study are presented below. An attempt has been made to maintain anonymity, while at the same time providing the reader with an understanding of the various contexts within which magnet schools and the Chapter 1 program interact. Statements reflecting individual opinion regarding the purpose or success of programs are based on our telephone interviews with respondents, and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of any other individuals, including the authors. The statistics presented in these profiles refer to the 1985-86 school year, unless otherwise noted.

District A

District A, located in the Western United States, has a public school enrollment of approximately 32,000. The minority enrollment is 55 percent. A court order to desegregate was enacted in 1974. The district received an Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) from 1980 until 1983. Well before imposition of the court order, the district had "a sort of magnet schools program," defined as "a few small, two-week, specialty classes in a some schools." The first full-year magnet school opened in 1972; a new magnet school is scheduled to open this fall. Currently, 50% of all public elementary and secondary schools are magnet schools. Magnet schools cover 16 different areas of interest/pedagogical styles, and most are total school programs. There are a few part-time magnet programs within a regular school. Almost all magnet schools serve grades K through 6--only two out of a total of 23 magnet schools is located at the junior high level. At the elementary level, magnet schools are the sole means of desegregating. At the secondary level, school attendance area boundary changes take place, and next year the district will begin pairing secondary schools. The district's minority population is growing rapidly, making desegregation efforts increasingly difficult.

Chapter 1 serves grades K through 12. Schools are targeted to receive Chapter 1 using student's place of residence as a basis for ranking. Out of a total of 46 public schools in the district, 24 (or just over half) receive Chapter 1 services. The vast majority of these Chapter 1 schools serve children in elementary grades. Forty percent of all public school students are served by Chapter 1. A Chapter 1 allocation of $3.7 million served a total of 13,000 public and private school students. If a child transfers to a non-Chapter 1 school (either during the school year or between school years), Chapter 1 services do not follow. A state compensatory education (SCE) program is administered jointly

with the Chapter 1 program, and places priority on students in the early grades.

Close to half of all magnet schools are Chapter 1 project schools (10 out of 23 magnet schools); Chapter 1 is viewed as an asset to these schools. In fact, one district official noted the need to "sell" non-Chapter 1 magnet schools to parents of children transferring to them. Magnet schools do, however, increase the likelihood of Chapter 1 students transferring to an ineligible school thereby losing services. This year one magnet school reportedly will lose a fair amount of Chapter 1 money due to higher achieving students transferring there. (The school is still eligible for Chapter 1 funds but the exact allocation is a function of the member of eligible, or needy, children actually attending the school.)

District B

District B is located in the Northwestern section of the country; there are 59,000 students enrolled in its public schools, 62 percent of whom are minority students. The first magnet schools were created in 1982; the district began to receive federal funds (through the Magnet Schools Assistance Act) for magnet development in 1985. Three additional elementary level magnet schools will begin to operate in the fall. Currently, the district has five magnet schools--two at the elementary level and three high schools; almost all are organized as schools within a school.

Magnet schools make up a minute proportion of total schools; only 5 schools out of 109 are magnet schools. The types of special programs offered in these schools are limited. Magnet schools are viewed foremost as arising out of public need for various extended-day or remedial services (at the elementary level) or interest in providing educational variety and specialization (in the upper grades). Mandatory busing by means of pairing schools and rezoning school boundaries is the primary method of desegregating schools; the district also provides "human relations training" for teachers and administrators as part of the desegregation effort.

Chapter 1 serves students in grades pre-K through 12. At least half of the schools at each level (elementary, junior, and senior high) are served by Chapter 1. Schools are targeted for Chapter 1 using student's place of residence as a basis for ranking. If a student transfers from a Chapter 1 school to a non-Chapter 1 school, services do not follow. This year, it was reported that all eligible children in targeted schools (or 15 percent of the district's enrollment) were served by Chapter 1 funds amounting to $8.2 million. There is no SCE

program in the state.

At the elementary level, one of the two magnet schools is a Chapter 1 school, while at the high school level one out of three magnet schools is served. Magnet schools and the Chapter 1 program are viewed as two separate efforts which do not conflict with one another. As noted, school pairing and rezoning of attendance areas have been employed to desegregate, but this is not viewed by respondents as an impediment to delivery of Chapter 1 services.

District C

There are 31,000 public school students enrolled in this Mid-western district; the minority enrollment is 68 percent. The district received a court order to desegregate in 1978. Initially, the plan included both voluntary and involuntary participation; currently the district does not mandate any forced busing and relies on its system of magnet schools to desegregate. There are 27 magnet schools. Almost half of all elementary schools (18 out of 38) offer magnet programs; 4 out of 6 middle or junior high schools are magnet schools, and all five high schools offer magnet programs.

The first magnet school opened in 1976, when the district received an ESAA grant; the most recent opened in 1980. District officials would like to expand the program, but there are no funds to do so. The system of magnet schools covers 12 different areas of special interest in both total school and school within a school settings.

Schools are targeted for Chapter 1 using student's place of residence as a basis for ranking schools. Chapter 1 serves students in grades K-10. This year approximately 22 percent of all public school students were served by Chapter 1. The total Chapter 1 allocation amounted to $4.2 million dollars, and served 6,800 public and private school students. Chapter 1 students could be found in half of all elementary schools, as well as half of all middle or junior high schools. If students transfer to ineligible schools, Chapter 1 services do not follow. There is a SCE program which is closely coordinated with Chapter 1.

Out of a total of 27 magnet schools, Chapter 1 services are offered in only six; most magnet schools are placed in the urban fringe areas and attempt to draw minority students away from the inner-city. The Chapter 1 and magnet school programs reportedly conflict with one another when students receiving Chapter 1 transfer to non-Chapter 1 schools. It is quite often the case, for example, that a Chapter 1 student in a magnet school receives only a fraction of the remedial instruction

received in the residential school; this can happen even with the help of SCE.

District D

This district is located in the Southwest region of the country; 44,000 children are enrolled in the public schools there, and of these, 35 percent are minority students. While at one time the district was under a court order to desegregate, this is no longer the case. The first magnet school opened in 1972, while the most recently created magnet school opened [about] 1982. Currently, magnet school development is on-hold, with no plans for expansion or reduction. At the elementary level, 11 out of 63 schools are magnet schools; out of 17 middle/junior high schools, three are magnet schools, and one out of nine high schools has a magnet program. All magnet schools are total school programs. When the court order was in effect, magnet schools were viewed primarily as a means to desegregate; at present they are viewed as a means also to achieve educational objectives. Magnet schools are described as "neighborhood schools" where definite preference is given to those children living close by. They are located both in predominantly white and predominantly black neighborhoods. For students living outside the neighborhood, a more complex selection process occurs.

Chapter 1 serves students in grades K-10. Of all public school students, 13 percent were served by Chapter 1. A total allocation of $4 million dollars* served students identified as eligible. Schools are targeted for Chapter 1 using student enrollment as a basis for ranking schools. There is no provision for Chapter 1 services to follow children who move to ineligible schools. Nearly 40 percent (25 out of 63) of all public elementary schools are Chapter 1 project schools, and about half (8 out of 17) of all middle/junior high schools are project schools.

While neither of the magnet schools serving the upper grades are Chapter 1 schools, all but one of the elementary magnet schools are served by Chapter 1. Overlap of the two programs is viewed as problematic in a philosophical sense; it is hoped that magnet schools will attract a more affluent, higher achieving student body, yet Chapter 1 services in a

* This figure is for 1984-85.

school denote the presence of educationally deprived students. Technically speaking, there have been few conflicts. District policy prohibits transfers of LD (learning disabled) students or those identified as eligible for Chapter 1 to non-Chapter 1 magnet schools. This policy prevents loss of services to Chapter 1 students which could otherwise occur due to changing enrollment patterns.

District E

There are 56,000 public school students enrolled in this Southeastern district 52 percent of whom are minority students. The first magnet school opened in 1973; the district was then and is now under a court order to desegregate. The most recent magnet school was created in 1981. One additional high school program is currently under consideration. Magnet schools are viewed primarily as a means to promote academic excellence and/or develop special educational interests; extensive busing (via clustering of schools) is the primary desegregation tool. As a result of forced busing, private school enrollments increased dramatically.

The district operates a total of nine magnet schools--a relatively small number compared to 97 total public elementary and secondary schools. Five magnets are at the elementary level, two are junior/middle schools, and two are high schools. All upper grade schools are organized as total school programs; at the elementary level, two are total schools and three are schools within a school (offering extended day enriched curriculum). At all levels, magnet schools are a tiny fraction of the total number of public schools. While all schools in the district must comply with racial balance requirements, magnet schools place secondary emphasis on academic achievement--most students admitted have higher test scores and grades.

Chapter 1 serves students in grades K through 8. The total Chapter 1 allocation of $6.3 million served 7,400 students. The public school students served account for roughly 13 percent of all public school students. If students transfer to ineligible schools, Chapter 1 services do not follow. A SCE program, serving students in grades 2 through 5 is administered separately from Chapter 1, and in some cases may help students in these grades who lose services.

Public schools are targeted for Chapter 1 using student enrollment as a basis for ranking. Educationally disadvantaged students attending non-public schools may receive Chapter 1 services if they reside in the attendance areas of eligible schools. Sixty-seven percent of all elementary schools were

served by Chapter 1, while close to half (8 out of 18) middle/junior schools were served.

There are cases in which magnet school designs (which center around attracting high achievers) interfere with the delivery of Chapter 1 services, both in terms of students losing Chapter 1 services as a result of attending a magnet school, as well as comparability problems (currently, 2 out of 9 magnet schools, both serving students in elementary grades, are Chapter 1 schools). However, these instances of the two programs conflicting are viewed as much less threatening to the Chapter 1 population than those brought on by forced busing.

District F

District F is located in the Southeast region of the country. A court ordered desegregation plan has been in effect since 1964, and with it the advent of mandatory busing. Close to 107,000 students are enrolled in the public schools; the minority enrollment is 23 percent. Magnet schools were formed in 1976 at four city schools. Currently, 27 schools offer magnet programs, most of which are organized as schools within schools. Of the 27 magnet schools, 13 are elementary, 6 are middle/junior high, and 8 are senior high schools. Initially, magnet schools were developed mainly to assist desegregation efforts. Currently, their mission is seen as ultimately the same but with greater emphasis on the means of achieving this goal rather than the goal itself; by providing parental choice and varied curriculum, officials hope to lure whites away from private schools and back into the public schools. Since public transportation to magnet schools is not provided (unless the magnet school is the neighborhood school), these schools rely heavily on the attractiveness of the particular program to draw in students living outside the regular attendance area. Magnet schools are reported to maintain the most even racial balances in the city.

Chapter 1 serves students in grades K-10. Chapter 1 schools are targeted using student's place of residence as a basis for ranking schools. Almost 80 percent of all public elementary schools are served by Chapter 1; close to half of all middle/junior high schools are served, but only 2 out of 14 high schools receive Chapter 1. Fourteen percent of all public school students received Chapter 1 services, provided with a total allocation of $16.1 million dollars. These services do not follow children transferring to ineligible schools.

Over half of all magnet schools receive Chapter 1; all but three of the 13 elementary magnet schools are Chapter 1 schools. In a broad sense Chapter 1 and magnet schools are viewed as complementary programs; Chapter 1 provides needed

remedial instruction while magnet programs attract and hold bright children in those same schools.

District G

Located in the Southwestern United States, district G has 128,000 students enrolled in its public schools, 79 percent of whom are minority students. A court order to desegregate was imposed in 1976; in the same year the first magnet school was created, and mandatory busing began. An attempt is underway to reduce the amount of mandatory busing that occurs. Recently, as a result of court action, many children who previously were bussed have been ordered back to their neighborhood schools. Concurrently, a system of what are referred to as "super schools" (these are not magnet schools) is evolving, which, will hopefully bridge the gap between majority and minority achievement levels by providing quality instruction in "the basics."

There are 23 magnet schools, most of which are located in middle/junior high and senior high schools; only five magnet schools serve children in the elementary grades. With the exception of the Montessori school (and private schools) children in grades K-3 enroll in schools in their neighborhood attendance areas; desegregation efforts have been limited to students above grade 4. Magnet schools account for a very small fraction of the district's public schools; the main incentive for their development is the provision of educational alternatives rather than desegregation.

Chapter 1 ranks schools for participation using student's place of residence. A total of 60 public schools (just over 30 percent of all public schools), all at the elementary level, received Chapter 1; these services are provided exclusively to students in grades K-3. Services do not follow children if they transfer to ineligible schools. Roughly 10 percent of all public school students are served, with a total allocation (which also serves a small number of private school students) of $13.6 million dollars.

Officials see no conflicts between the provision of Chapter 1 services and magnet schools. Since Chapter 1 is restricted to students in grades K-3, and desegregation efforts are aimed at students in grades 4 and above, there is no reason for program interaction of either a positive or negative nature. Further, Chapter 1 services are not offered in any magnet schools. The emphasis of Chapter 1 on grades K-3 and desegregation on upper grades was not a result of minimizing conflicts between the programs, but rather officials' sentiments about the ages of which children should travel beyond the neighborhood school.

District H

District H is located in the Northeast. There are 45,000 children enrolled in the public schools, 56 percent of whom are minority students. The magnet schools program began in 1976, the same year that a court order to desegregate was imposed. Mandatory busing is also used; currently about 50 percent of the school-aged population is bussed.

The most recent magnet school was created in June 1985, and plans for three additional schools are underway to further expand the offering of magnet programs (students can now choose from 20 different types of magnet schools). Twenty-six percent of all public schools offer magnet programs, the majority of which are offered to students in the elementary grades. Out of a total of 20 magnet schools, 6 are senior high schools. Magnet schools are viewed as both a means to assist desegregation and to provide educational choice and opportunities to excel.

Chapter 1 serves students in grades K-8. Chapter 1 schools are targeted using student's place of residence as a basis for ranking schools; 62 percent of all public schools receive Chapter 1 services. A SCE program serves students in secondary schools. Twelve percent of all public school students are served with a total Chapter 1 allocation of $11.2 million dollars (the allocation includes money spent on a small number of students in private schools). If students transfer to ineligible schools, Chapter 1 services do not follow, but currently all elementary magnet schools are Chapter 1 project schools.

Chapter 1 impacts positively on magnet schools; magnet school administrators express a desire for additional Chapter 1 services. Currently, all schools offering magnet programs to students in grade spans served by Chapter 1 are Chapter 1 project schools. Magnet programs are viewed as a complement to Chapter 1 service delivery because the Chapter 1 eligible population in these schools is slowly diminishing, presumably due to a high quality education.

District I

District I is located in the Northeast and has an enrollment of 91,638 students in the public schools. The minority population of the district is 30 percent. The magnet school program began in 1977 when noticeable pockets of high minority-concentration schools appeared in one section of the district. Since 1977, the minority concentration in the district increased and recently levelled off. The number of magnet schools concomitantly increased during this period.

Today the district operates 18 magnet schools that are located in two sections of the district where minority enrollments hover around 60 percent; 16 of these schools are at the elementary level, one is at the middle school level, and the last is a high school. District officials expect the program to expand especially given local citizens' objections to busing to achieve racial balance and are interested in obtaining federal assistance to do so. To date, they have relied primarily on local funds, with some state assistance devoted to the development of the secondary school magnet program. No court order to desegregate exists in the district and the magnet program along with a Quality Integrated Education district-level office are the only desegregation efforts.

The magnet schools in this district are a small percentage (13%) of all schools. They include both total school and school within a school design and focus on such themes as French/Spanish immersion, communication arts, gifted and talented, computer science, and full-day kindergarten. The district embarked on the use of magnet schools to respond proactively to the changing racial configuration of segments of the district. Beyond ensuring racial balance within these areas through a carefully monitored transfer policy that does not permit a child to transfer in if it destabilizes either the sending or receiving school, the magnet schools program emphasizes instructional alternatives for pupils (and to some extent, teachers) in the district. Additional fiscal resources provided magnet schools are slight, amounting to approximately $5.00 extra per pupil. This figure, however, is exclusive of transportation (which is guaranteed) and special resources obtained from other district departments (e.g., computers and summer school funding).

Chapter 1 exclusively serves students in the elementary grades. Twenty-four of the 102 elementary schools in the district operate Chapter 1 funded projects; approximately 3,200 public and private school students (3.5 percent of total enrollment) are helped by these projects. The districts' Chapter 1 allocation amounts to $2,732,301, or $854 per pupil served. School attendance areas are ranked by school enrollment rather than student's residence. Chapter 1 eligible students transferring to ineligible project schools discontinue receipt of Chapter 1 services because no provisions exist to follow the child. There is no SCE program in the state.

At the elementary level 14 of the 16 magnet schools also are Chapter 1 project schools. The fact that so many magnet schools are also Chapter 1 schools was reported as coincidence; the schools with high minority concentration just happen to be those with greater proportions of poor students. In fact, parents of children in the magnet schools without Chapter 1 projects have approached the school board to request extension

of Chapter 1 services to their schools. Few problems were reported in administering the two programs; comparability posed no issue nor did shifts in school or student eligibility for Chapter 1. One Chapter 1 respondent noted the importance of reducing fragmentation in a child's day but observed this was a general emphasis across the district. No special Chapter 1 guidelines or practices were employed in dealing with magnet schools in the district. An evaluation conducted by the district did reveal, however, that Chapter 1 resources helped magnet schools by raising the adult/child ratio in magnet schools over that of non-magnet schools.